KAREN P. HEWITT
United States Attorney
LAWRENCE A. CASPER
Assistant U.S. Attorney
California State Bar No. 235110
Federal Office Building
880 Front Street, Room 6293
San Diego, California 92101-8893
Telephone No.: (619) 557-7455
Facsimile No.: (619) 235-2757
Lawrence.Casper@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff
United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. JAIME MOJICA-GONZALEZ, Defendant.	Criminal Case No. 08CR1006-BTM District Judge: Hon. Barry T. Moskowitz Courtroom: 15 (Fifth Floor) Date: May 9, 2008 Time: 2:00 p.m. UNITED STATES' RESPONSE AND OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS TO: (1) COMPEL DISCOVERY: (2) DISMISS INDICTMENT DUE TO MISINSTRUCTION OF THE GRAND JURY; AND (3) GRANT LEAVE TO FILE FURTHER MOTIONS TOGETHER WITH STATEMENT OF FACTS, MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES AND GOVERNMENT'S MOTIONS: (1) TO COMPEL FINGERPRINT EXEMPLARS; & (2) FOR PRODUCTION OF RECIPROCAL DISCOVERY.

Plaintiff, the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, by and through its counsel KAREN P. HEWITT, United States Attorney, and LAWRENCE A. CASPER, Assistant U.S. Attorney, hereby files its Response and Opposition (R&O) to the above-described motions of Defendant Jaime Mojica-Gonzalez ("Defendant") and its own motions for fingerprint exemplars and reciprocal discovery. This R&O and United States' motions are based upon the files and records of this case.

I

STATEMENT OF FACTS

A. Statement of the Case

On April 2, 2008, a federal grand jury handed up a one-count Indictment charging Defendant Jaime Mojica-Gonzalez with: (1) one count of being a deported alien found in the United States in violation of Title 8, United States Code, Section 1326. Defendant entered a not guilty plea before the Magistrate Judge on April 11, 2008.

B. Statement of Facts

On January 22, 2008 Supervisory Border Patrol Agent Abel Rivera was performing line watch duties in the Chula Vista Station's area of responsibility. Upon receiving a radio call from Border Patrol Agent Derek Gardner, who observed a group of suspected illegal aliens north of the United States/Mexico International Boundary in an area known as "Palm Canyon." That area is located approximately 4 miles east of the Otay Mesa, California Port of Entry and 3 miles north of the United States/Mexico International Boundary. Agent Rivera responded to the area where the individuals were last seen and waited along the trail for the group to reach his location.

After a brief wait, three individuals walked up to Agent Rivera's location. Agent Rivera approached the individuals, identified himself as a Border Patrol agent and questioned the individuals as to their citizenship. When asked of what country they were citizens, Defendant and the other members of the group answered "Mexico." When asked if anyone had immigration documents allowing them to be present in the United States legally, Defendant and the others answered "No." Upon being asked if they had been walking for a long time, Defendant stated that they had entered the United States on January 21, 2008 being guided by two individuals. Defendant stated that the foot guides walked them up into the mountains and then left them alone. At approximately 8:01 a.m. on January 22, 2008, Defendant (and the other individuals) were placed under arrest.

Defendant and the others were transported to the Chula Vista Border Patrol Station for processing. Defendant was determined to have a previous immigration and criminal history. On January 22, 2008, at approximately 11:23 a.m., Defendant was advised that his administrative rights no longer applied and that criminal charges were being contemplated. Defendant stated that he understood. Defendant was then advised of his Miranda rights in the Spanish language. Defendant stated that he understood his rights and invoked. No further questions were asked. Defendant was advised of his consular rights and chose not to speak with the Consulate. These proceedings were witnessed by Senior Patrol Agent Robert Brooks and were videotaped.

C. Defendant's Criminal History

Defendant has the following criminal history:

3/7/1991 (CAMC San Diego)	11550 HS - Use/Under Influence of Controlled Substance (misd)	90 days; 5 years probation
4/3/1991 (CASC San Diego)	211 PC Robbery-Armed with a firearm	4 years jail

D. Defendant's Immigration History

Defendant has been previously apprehended for being in the United States illegally and was ordered deported on December 6, 2007, after a hearing before an immigration judge. He was most recently removed from the United States on that same date, less than two months before his arrest in this case.

II

ARGUMENT

A. The Government Will Comply With All Discovery Obligations

The Government intends to continue full compliance with its discovery obligations under Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), the Jencks Act (18 U.S.C. 3500), and Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.[1/] To date, the Government has provided 28 pages of discovery; a DVD that includes the advisal of rights and post-Miranda invocation of Defendant; and a tape containing the Defendant's deportation hearing. The United States Attorney's Office

[1] Unless otherwise noted, all references to "Rules" refers to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

recently learned that there was a second A-file for this Defendant, immediately advised counsel for the Defendant of that fact, and advised counsel that it was awaiting receipt of that file so that appropriate discovery materials could be turned over. As of this date, that file has not yet been received. The Government anticipates that all discovery issues can be resolved amicably and informally, and has addressed Defendant's specific requests below.

(1) Defendant's Statements

The Government recognizes its obligation under Rules 16(a)(1)(A) and 16(a)(1)(B) to provide to Defendant the substance of Defendant's oral statements and Defendant's written statements. The Government has produced all of the Defendant's statements that are known to the undersigned Assistant U.S. Attorney at this date. If the Government discovers additional oral or written statements that require disclosure under Rule 16(a)(1)(A) or Rule 16(a)(1)(B), such statements will be provided to Defendant.

The Government has no objection to the preservation of the handwritten notes taken by any of the agents and officers. See United States v. Harris, 543 F.2d 1247, 1253 (9th Cir. 1976) (agents must preserve their original notes of interviews of an accused or prospective government witnesses). However, the Government objects to providing Defendant with a copy of the rough notes at this time. Rule 16(a)(1)(A) does not require disclosure of the rough notes where the content of those notes have been accurately reflected in a type-written report. See United States v. Brown, 303 F.3d 582, 590 (5th Cir. 2002); United States v. Coe, 220 F.3d 573, 583 (7th Cir. 2000) (Rule 16(a)(1)(A) does not require disclosure of an agent's notes even where there are "minor discrepancies" between the notes and a report). The Government is not required to produce rough notes pursuant to the Jencks Act, because the notes do not constitute "statements" (as defined 18 U.S.C. § 3500(e)) unless the notes (1) comprise both a substantially verbatim narrative of a witness' assertion, and (2) have been approved or adopted by the witness. United States v. Spencer, 618 F.2d 605, 606-07 (9th Cir. 1980). The rough notes in this case do not constitute "statements" in accordance with the Jencks Act. See United States v. Ramirez, 954 F.2d 1035, 1038-39 (5th Cir. 1992) (rough notes were not statements under the Jencks Act where notes were scattered and all the information contained in the notes was available in other forms).

The notes are not Brady material because the notes do not present any material exculpatory information, or any evidence favorable to Defendant that is material to guilt or punishment. Brown, 303 F.3d at 595-96 (rough notes were not Brady material because the notes were neither favorable to the defense nor material to defendant's guilt or punishment); United States v. Ramos, 27 F.3d 65, 71 (3d Cir. 1994) (mere speculation that agents' rough notes contained Brady evidence was insufficient). If, during a future evidentiary hearing, certain rough notes become discoverable under Rule 16, the Jencks Act, or Brady, the notes in question will be provided to Defendant.

(2) Arrest reports, notes, dispatch tapes

The Government has provided Defendant with all known reports related to Defendant's arrest in this case that are available at this time. The Government will continue to comply with its obligation to provide to Defendant all reports subject to Rule 16. As previously noted, the Government has no objection to the preservation of the agents' handwritten notes, but objects to providing Defendant with a copy of the rough notes at this time because the notes are not subject to disclosure under Rule 16, the Jencks Act, or Brady. The United States will produce dispatch tapes, if any, relating to the Defendant's arrest in this case.

(3) Brady Material

The Government has and will continue to perform its duty under Brady to disclose material exculpatory information or evidence favorable to Defendant when such evidence is material to guilt or punishment. The Government recognizes that its obligation under Brady covers not only exculpatory evidence, but also evidence that could be used to impeach witnesses who testify on behalf of the United States. See Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150, 154 (1972); United States v. Bagley, 473 U.S. 667, 676-77 (1985). This obligation also extends to evidence that was not requested by the defense. Bagley, 473 U.S. at 682; United States v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97, 107-10 (1976). "Evidence is material, and must be disclosed (pursuant to Brady), 'if there is a reasonable probability that, had the evidence been disclosed to the defense, the result of the proceeding would have been different.'" Carriger v. Stewart, 132 F.3d 463, 479 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc). The final determination of materiality is based on the "suppressed evidence considered collectively, not item by item." Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419, 436-37 (1995).

Brady does not, however, mandate that the Government open all of its files for discovery. See United States v. Henke, 222 F.3d 633, 642-44 (9th Cir. 2000)(per curiam). Under Brady, the Government is not required to provide: (1) neutral, irrelevant, speculative, or inculpatory evidence (see United States v. Smith, 282 F.3d 758, 770 (9th Cir. 2002)); (2) evidence available to the defendant from other sources (see United States v. Bracy, 67 F.3d 1421, 1428-29 (9th Cir. 1995)); (3) evidence that the defendant already possesses (see United States v. Mikaelian, 168 F.3d 380, 389-90 (9th Cir. 1999), amended by 180 F.3d 1091 (9th Cir. 1999)); or (4) evidence that the undersigned Assistant U.S. Attorney could not reasonably be imputed to have knowledge or control over. (see United States v. Hanson, 262 F.3d 1217, 1234-35 (11th Cir. 2001)). Nor does Brady require the Government "to create exculpatory evidence that does not exist," United States v. Sukumolahan, 610 F.2d 685, 687 (9th Cir. 1980), but only requires that the Government "supply a defendant with exculpatory information of which it is aware." United States v. Flores, 540 F.2d 432, 438 (9th Cir. 1976).

(4) Sentencing Information

The United States is not obligated under Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and its progeny to furnish a defendant with information which he already knows. United States v. Taylor, 802 F.2d 1108, 1118 n.5 (9th Cir. 1986). Brady is a rule of disclosure, and therefore, there can be no violation of Brady if the evidence is already known to the defendant. In such case, the United States has not suppressed the evidence and consequently has no Brady obligation. See United States v. Gaggi, 811 F.2d 47, 59 (2d Cir. 1987).

But even assuming Defendant does not already possess the information about factors which might affect his guideline range, the United States would not be required to provide information bearing on Defendant's mitigation of punishment until after Defendant's conviction or plea of guilty and prior to his sentencing date. See United States v. Juvenile Male, 864 F.2d 641, 647 (9th Cir. 1988) ("No [Brady] violation occurs if the evidence is disclosed to the defendant at a time when the disclosure remains in value."). Accordingly, Defendant's demand for this information is premature.

(5) Defendant's Prior Record

The United States has already provided Defendant with a copy of any criminal record in accordance with Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16(a)(1)(D).

(6) Proposed 404(b) and 609 Evidence

Should the United States seek to introduce any similar act evidence pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 404(b) or 609(b), the United States will provide Defendant with notice of its proposed use of such evidence and information about such bad act at or before the time the United States' trial memorandum is filed. The United States reserves the right to introduce as prior act evidence any conviction, arrest or prior act that is disclosed to the defense in discovery.

(7) Evidence Seized

The United States has complied and will continue to comply with Rule 16(a)(1)(C) in allowing Defendant an opportunity, upon reasonable notice, to examine, copy and inspect physical evidence which is within the possession, custody or control of the United States, and which is material to the preparation of Defendant's defense or are intended for use by the United States as evidence in chief at trial, or were obtained from or belong to Defendant, including photographs.

The United States, however, need not produce rebuttal evidence in advance of trial. United States v. Givens, 767 F.2d 574, 584 (9th Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 474 U.S. 953 (1985).

(8) Request for Preservation of Evidence

After issuance of a an order from the Court, the United States will preserve all evidence to which Defendant is entitled to pursuant to the relevant discovery rules. However, the United States objects to Defendant's blanket request to preserve all physical evidence.

The United States has complied and will continue to comply with Rule 16(a)(1)(C) in allowing Defendant an opportunity, upon reasonable notice, to examine, copy and inspect physical evidence which is within his possession, custody or control of the United States, and which is material to the preparation of Defendant's defense or are intended for use by the United

States as evidence in chief at trial, or were obtained from or belong to Defendant, including photographs. The United States has made the evidence available to Defendant and Defendant's investigators and will comply with any request for inspection.

(9) Henthorn Material

The Government will comply with United States v. Henthorn, 931 F.2d 29 (9th Cir. 1991) and request that all federal agencies involved in the criminal investigation and prosecution review the personnel files of the federal law enforcement inspectors, officers, and special agents whom the Government intends to call at trial and disclose information favorable to the defense that meets the appropriate standard of materiality. United States v. Booth, 309 F.3d 566, 574 (9th Cir. 2002)(citing United States v. Jennings, 960 F.2d 1488, 1489 (9th Cir. 1992). If the undersigned Assistant U.S. Attorney is uncertain whether certain incriminating information in the personnel files is "material," the information will be submitted to the Court for an in camera inspection and review.

(10) Tangible Objects

The Government has complied and will continue to comply with Rule 16(a)(1)(E) in allowing Defendant an opportunity, upon reasonable notice, to examine, inspect, and copy all tangible objects seized that are within its possession, custody, or control, and that are either material to the preparation of Defendant's defense, or are intended for use by the Government as evidence during its case-in-chief at trial, or were obtained from or belong to Defendant. The Government need not, however, produce rebuttal evidence in advance of trial. United States v. Givens, 767 F.2d 574, 584 (9th Cir. 1984).

(11) Expert Witnesses

The Government will comply with Rule 16(a)(1)(G) and provide Defendant with a written summary of any expert testimony that the Government intends to use under Rules 702, 703, or 705 of the Federal Rules of Evidence during its case-in-chief at trial. This summary shall include the expert witnesses' qualifications, the expert witnesses opinions, the bases, and reasons for those opinions.

(12) Impeachment Evidence

The Government recognizes its obligation under Brady and Giglio to provide evidence that could be used to impeach Government witnesses including material information regarding demonstrable bias or motive to lie.

(13) Evidence of Criminal Investigation of Any Government Witness

Defendants are not entitled to any evidence that a prospective witness is under criminal investigation by federal, state, or local authorities. "[T]he criminal records of such [Government] witnesses are not discoverable." United States v. Taylor, 542 F.2d 1023, 1026 (8th Cir. 1976); United States v. Riley, 657 F.2d 1377, 1389 (8th Cir. 1981) (holding that since criminal records of prosecution witnesses are not discoverable under Rule 16, rap sheets are not either); cf. United States v. Rinn, 586 F.2d 113, 118-19 (9th Cir. 1978) (noting in dicta that "[i]t has been said that the Government has no discovery obligation under Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(a)(1)(C) to supply a defendant with the criminal records of the Government's intended witnesses.") (citing Taylor, 542 F.2d at 1026).

The Government will, however, provide the conviction record, if any, which could be used to impeach witnesses the Government intends to call in its case-in-chief. When disclosing such information, disclosure need only extend to witnesses the United States intends to call in its case-in-chief. United States v. Gering, 716 F.2d 615, 621 (9th Cir. 1983); United States v. Angelini, 607 F.2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1979).

(14) Evidence of Bias or Motive To Lie

The United States is unaware of any evidence indicating that a prospective witness is biased or prejudiced against Defendant. The United States is also unaware of any evidence that prospective witnesses have a motive to falsify or distort testimony.

(15) Evidence Affecting Perception, Recollection, Ability to Communicate, or Truth Telling

The United States is unaware of any evidence indicating that a prospective witness has a problem with perception, recollection, communication, or truth-telling. The United States recognizes its obligation under Brady and Giglio to provide material evidence that could be used to impeach Government witnesses including material information related to perception, recollection or ability to communicate. The Government objects to providing any evidence that a witness has ever used narcotics or other controlled substances, or has ever been an alcoholic because such information is not discoverable under Rule 16, Brady, Giglio, Henthorn, or any other Constitutional or statutory disclosure provision.

(16) Witness Addresses

The Government has already provided Defendant with the reports containing the names of the agents involved in the apprehension and interviews of Defendant. A defendant in a non-capital case, however, has no right to discover the identity of prospective Government witnesses prior to trial. See Weatherford v. Bursey, 429 U.S. 545, 559 (1977); United States v. Dishner, 974 F.2d 1502, 1522 (9th Cir 1992) (citing United States v. Steel, 759 F.2d 706, 709 (9th Cir. 1985)); United States v. Hicks, 103 F.23d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 1996). Nevertheless, in its trial memorandum, the Government will provide Defendant with a list of all witnesses whom it intends to call in its case-in-chief, although delivery of such a witness list is not required. See United States v. Discher, 960 F.2d 870 (9th Cir. 1992); United States v. Mills, 810 F.2d 907, 910 (9th Cir. 1987).

The Government objects to any request that the Government provide a list of every witness to the crimes charged who will not be called as a Government witness. "There is no statutory basis for granting such broad requests," and a request for the names and addresses of witnesses who will not be called at trial "far exceed[s] the parameters of Rule 16(a)(1)(C)." United States v. Hsin-Yung, 97 F. Supp.2d 24, 36 (D. D.C. 2000) (quoting United States v. Boffa, 513 F. Supp. 444, 502 (D. Del. 1980)). The Government is not required to produce all possible information and evidence regarding any speculative defense claimed by Defendant. Wood v. Bartholomew, 516 U.S. 1, 6-8 (1995) (per curiam) (holding that inadmissible materials that are not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible exculpatory evidence are not subject to disclosure under Brady).

(17) Names of Witnesses Favorable to the Defendant

As stated earlier, the Government will continue to comply with its obligations under Brady and its progeny. At the present time, the Government is not aware of any witnesses who have made an arguably favorable statement concerning the defendant.

(18) Statements Relevant to the Defense

The United States will comply with all of its discovery obligations. However, "the prosecution does not have a constitutional duty to disclose every bit of information that might affect the jury's decision; it need only disclose information favorable to the defense that meets the appropriate standard of materiality." Gardner, 611 F.2d at 774-775 (citation omitted).

(19) Jencks Act Material

The Jencks Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3500, requires that, after a Government witness has testified on direct examination, the Government must give the Defendant any "statement" (as defined by the Jencks Act) in the Government's possession that was made by the witness relating to the subject matter to which the witness testified. 18 U.S.C. § 3500(b). A "statement" under the Jencks Act is (1) a written statement made by the witness and signed or otherwise adopted or approved by him, (2) a substantially verbatim, contemporaneously recorded transcription of the witness's oral statement, or (3) a statement by the witness before a grand jury. 18 U.S.C. § 3500(e). If notes are read back to a witness to see whether or not the government agent correctly understood what the witness was saying, that act constitutes "adoption by the witness" for purposes of the Jencks Act. United States v. Boshell, 952 F.2d 1101, 1105 (9th Cir. 1991) (citing Goldberg v. United States, 425 U.S. 94, 98 (1976)). While the Government is only required to produce all Jencks Act material after the witness testifies, the Government plans to provide most (if not all) Jencks Act material well in advance of trial to avoid any needless delays.

(20) Giglio Information

As stated previously, the United States will comply with its obligations pursuant to Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), the Jencks Act, United States v. Henthorn, 931 F.2d 29 (9th Cir. 1991), and Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150 (1972).

(21) Immunity/Other Agreements

The United States is not aware of any such agreements.

(22) Informants and Cooperating Witnesses

If the Government determines that there is a confidential informant who has information that is "relevant and helpful to the defense of an accused, or is essential to a fair determination of a cause," the Government will either disclose the identity of the informant or submit the informant's identity to the Court for an in-chambers inspection. See Roviaro v. United States, 353 U.S. 53, 60-61 (1957) (emphasis added); United States v. Ramirez-Rangel, 103 F.3d 1501, 1505 (9th Cir. 1997) (same).

(23) Evidence of Bias by Informants/Cooperating Witnesses

The United States is unaware of any evidence indicating that a prospective witness is biased or prejudiced against Defendant. The United States is also unaware of any evidence that prospective witnesses have a motive to falsify or distort testimony.

(24) Personnel Records of Government Officers Involved in the Arrest

The United States objects to this request. Defendant has not shown how any personnel records of the arresting officers are relevant to this case. Defense counsel has no constitutional right to conduct a search of agency files to argue relevance. See Pennsylvania v. Ritchie, 480 U.S. 39, 59-60 (1987) (citing Weatherford v. Bursey, 429 U.S. 545, 559 (1977) ("There is no general constitutional right to discovery in a criminal case, and Brady did not create one")). Thus, the United States will review these records for impeachment information and fully comply with its Henthorn obligations, but will not provide these records as Rule 16 discovery.

(25) Training of Relevant Law Enforcement Officers

Defendant's motion for extensive materials regarding training of law enforcement officers including written, videotaped and other policies, training instructions and manuals to employees should be denied. Defendant cites no authority that would entitle him to such discovery in general or as applied to the facts of this case.

(26) Residual Request

The Government will comply with all of its discovery obligations, but objects to the broad and unspecified nature of Defendant's residual discovery request.

B. The Grand Jurors Were Properly Instructed

1. Introduction

Defendant makes contentions relating to two separate instructions given to the grand jury during its impanelment by District Judge Larry A. Burns on January 10, 2007. [Memorandum of Points and Authorities, pp. 7-23 (hereinafter "Memorandum")[2/] Although recognizing that the Ninth Circuit in United States v. Navarro-Vargas, 408 F.3d 1184 (9th Cir. 2005) (en banc) generally found the two grand jury instructions constitutional, Defendant here contends Judge Burns went beyond the text of the approved instructions, and by so doing rendered them improper to the point that the Indictment should be dismissed. In fact, the identical arguments advanced by Defendant here were previously rejected in a 12 page written order issued by this Court. See Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Dismiss the Indictment in United States v. Manuel Martinez-Covarrubias, No. 07cr0491-BTM, filed October 11, 2007 (Appendix 3, hereto).[3/] Moreover, these arguments have explicitly been rejected by other United States District Judges in this District as well. See, e.g., Amended Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Dismiss the Indictment in United States v. Diana Jimenez-Bermudez, 07cr1372-JAH (Appendix 4, hereto).

. In making his arguments concerning the two separate instructions, Defendant urges this Court to dismiss the Indictment on two separate bases relating to grand jury procedures, both of which were discussed in United States v. Isgro, 974 F.2d 1091 (9th Cir. 1992). Concerning the first attacked instruction, Defendant urges this Court to dismiss the Indictment by exercising its

---

[2] A "Partial Transcript" of the grand jury proceedings which records the instructions to the impaneled grand jurors after the voir dire had been conducted is supplied with this response. [Appendix 1.] A redacted "Supplemental Transcript" which records relevant portions of the voir dire proceedings is also provided. [Appendix 2.]

[3] Although the Defendant in this case asks the Court (Def. Mem. at 23 n.9) to order production of the grand jury transcript and relies upon Covarrubias, absent the identification by Defendant of some exculpatory information – not merely mitigating information or information pertaining to an affirmative defense – disclosure of the transcript would merely be an unnecessary and unwarranted fishing expedition in this case.

supervising powers over grand jury procedures. [Memorandum at 21]. This is a practice the Supreme Court discourages as Defendant acknowledges, citing United States v. Williams, 504 U.S. 36, 50 (1992) ("Given the grand jury's operational separateness from its constituting court, it should come as no surprise that we have been reluctant to invoke the judicial supervisory power as a basis for prescribing modes of grand jury procedure. "). [Id.] Isgro reiterated:

> [A] district court may draw on its supervisory powers to dismiss an indictment. The supervisory powers doctrine "is premised on the inherent ability of the federal courts to formulate procedural rules not specifically required by the Constitution or Congress to supervise the administration of justice." Before it may invoke this power, a court must first find that the defendant is actually prejudiced by the misconduct. Absent such prejudice-that is, absent "'grave' doubt that the decision to indict was free from the substantial influence of [the misconduct]"-a dismissal is not warranted.

974 F.2d at 1094 (citation omitted, emphasis added). Concerning the second attacked instruction, in an attempt to dodge the holding in Williams, Defendant appears to base his contentions on the Constitution as a reason to dismiss the Indictment. Concerning that kind of a contention Isgro stated:

> [A] court may dismiss an indictment if it perceives constitutional error that interferes with the grand jury's independence and the integrity of the grand jury proceeding. "Constitutional error is found where the 'structural protections of the grand jury have been so compromised as to render the proceedings fundamentally unfair, allowing the presumption of prejudice' to the defendant." Constitutional error may also be found "if [the] defendant can show a history of prosecutorial misconduct that is so systematic and pervasive that it affects the fundamental fairness of the proceeding or if the independence of the grand jury is substantially infringed."

974 F.2d at 1094 (citation omitted).[4/]

The portions of the two relevant instructions approved in Navarro-Vargas were:

> You cannot judge the wisdom of the criminal laws enacted by Congress, that is, whether or not there should or should not be a federal law designating certain activity as criminal. That is to be determined by Congress and not by you.

408 F.3d at 1187, 1202.

> The United States Attorney and his Assistant United States Attorneys will provide you with important service in helping you to find your way when

---

[4] In Isgro the defendants choose the abrogation of constitutional rights route when asserting that prosecutors have a duty to present exculpatory evidence to grand juries. They did not prevail. 974 F.2d at 1096 ("we find that there was no abrogation of constitutional rights sufficient to support the dismissal of the indictment." (relying on Williams)).

> confronted with complex legal problems. It is entirely proper that you should receive this assistance. If past experience is any indication of what to expect in the future, then you can expect candor, honesty, and good faith in matters presented by the government attorneys.

408 F.3d at 1187, 1206.

Concerning the "wisdom of the criminal laws" instruction, the court stated it was constitutional because, among other things, "[i]f a grand jury can sit in judgment of wisdom of the policy behind a law, then the power to return a no bill in such cases is the clearest form of 'jury nullification.'"[5/] 408 F.3d at 1203 (footnote omitted). "Furthermore, the grand jury has few tools for informing itself of the policy or legal justification for the law; it receives no briefs or arguments from the parties. The grand jury has little but its own visceral reaction on which to judge the 'wisdom of the law.'" Id.

Concerning the "United States Attorney and his Assistant United States Attorneys" instruction, the court stated:

> We also reject this final contention and hold that although this passage may include unnecessary language, it does not violate the Constitution. The "candor, honesty, and good faith" language, when read in the context of the instructions as a whole, does not violate the constitutional relationship between the prosecutor and grand jury. . . . The instructions balance the praise for the government's attorney by informing the grand jurors that some have criticized the grand jury as a "mere rubber stamp" to the prosecution and reminding them that the grand jury is "independent of the United States Attorney[.]"

408 F.3d at 1207. Id. "The phrase is not vouching for the prosecutor, but is closer to advising the grand jury of the presumption of regularity and good faith that the branches of government ordinarily afford each other." Id.

2. The Expanded "Wisdom of the Criminal Laws" Instruction Was Proper

Concerning whether the new grand jurors should concern themselves with the wisdom of the criminal laws enacted by Congress, Judge Burns' full instruction stated:

---

[5] The Court acknowledged that as a matter of fact jury nullification does take place, and there is no way to control it. "We recognize and do not discount that some grand jurors might in fact vote to return a no bill because they regard the law as unwise at best or even unconstitutional. For all the reasons we have discussed, there is no post hoc remedy for that; the grand jury's motives are not open to examination." 408 F.3d at 1204 (emphasis in original).

> You understood from the questions and answers that a couple of people were excused, I think three in this case, because they could not adhere to the principle that I'm about to tell you.
>
> But it's not for you to judge the wisdom of the criminal laws enacted by congress; that is, whether or not there should be a federal law or should not be a federal law designating certain activity is criminal is not up to you. That's a judgment that congress makes.
>
> And if you disagree with the judgment made by congress, then your option is not to say "Well I'm going to vote against indicting even though I think that the evidence is sufficient" or "I'm going to vote in favor of even though the evidence may be insufficient." Instead, your obligation is to contact your congressman or advocate for a change in the laws, but not to bring your personal definition of what the law ought to be and try to impose that through applying it in a grand jury setting.

Partial Transcript pp. 8-9.[6/]

Defendant acknowledges that, in line with Navarro-Vargas, "Judge Bums instructed the grand jurors that they were forbidden 'from judg[ing] the wisdom of the criminal laws enacted by Congress; that is, whether or not there should be a federal law or should not be a federal law designating certain activity [as] criminal is not up to you.'" [Memorandum p. 8.] Defendant notes, however, that "[t]he instructions go beyond that, however, and tell the grand jurors that, should 'you disagree with that judgment made by Congress, then your option is not to say 'well, I'm going to vote against indicting even though I think that the evidence is sufficient' or 'I'm going to vote in favor of even though the evidence maybe insufficient.'" [Memorandum p. 8.] Defendant contends that this addition to the approved instruction, "flatly bars the grand jury from declining to indict because the grand jurors disagree with a proposed prosecution." [Memorandum p. 8.] Defendant further contends that the flat prohibition was preemptively reinforced by Judge Burns when he "referred to an instance in the grand juror selection process in which he excused three potential jurors," which resulted in his "not only instruct[ing] the grand

---

[6] The Supplemental Transcript supplied herewith (Appendix 2) recounts the excusing of the three individuals. This transcript involves the voir dire portion of the grand jury selection process, and has been redacted, to include redaction of the individual names, to provide only the relevant three incidents wherein prospective grand jurors were excused. Specifically, the pages of the Supplemental Transcript supplied are: page 15, line 10 - page 17, line 18; page 24, line 14 - page 28, line 2; page 38, line 9 - page 44, line 17.

jurors on his view of their discretion; [but his] enforc[ing] that view on pain of being excused from service as a grand juror."[7] [Memorandum p. 8.]

In concocting his theory of why Judge Burns erred, Defendant posits that the expanded instruction renders irrelevant the debate about what the word "should" means. [Memorandum p 9.] Defendant's argument mixes-up two of the holdings in Navarro-Vargas in the hope they will blend into one. They do not.

Navarro-Vargas does permit flatly barring the grand jury from disagreeing with the wisdom of the criminal laws. The statement, "[y]ou cannot judge the wisdom of the criminal laws enacted by Congress," (emphasis added) authorized by Navarro-Vargas, 408 F.3d at 1187, 1202, is not an expression of discretion. Jury nullification is forbidden although acknowledged as a sub rosa fact in grand jury proceedings. 408 F.3d at 1204. In this respect Judge Burns was absolutely within his rights, and within the law, when he excused the three prospective grand jurors because of their expressed inability to apply the laws passed by Congress. Similarly, it was proper for him to remind the impaneled grand jurors that they could not question the wisdom of the laws. As we will establish, this reminder did not pressure the grand jurors to give up their discretion not to return an indictment. Judge Burns' words cannot be parsed to say that they flatly barred the grand jury from declining to indict because the grand jurors disagree with a proposed prosecution, because they do not say that. That aspect of a grand jury's discretionary power (i.e. disagreement with the prosecution) was dealt with in Navarro-Vargas in its discussion of another instruction wherein the term "should" was germane.[8] 408 F.3d at 1204-06 ("'Should' Indict if Probable

---

[7] See Appendix 2.

[8] That instruction is not at issue here. It read as follows:

> [Y]our task is to determine whether the government's evidence as presented to you is sufficient to cause you to conclude that there is probable cause to believe that the accused is guilty of the offense charged. To put it another way, you should vote to indict where the evidence presented to you is sufficiently strong to warrant a reasonable person's believing that the accused is probably guilty of the offense with which the accused is charged.

408 F.3d at 1187.

Cause Is Found"). This other instruction bestows discretion on the grand jury not to indict.[9/] In finding this instruction constitutional, the court stated in words that ring true here, "It is the grand jury's position in the constitutional scheme that gives it its independence, not any instructions that a court might offer." 408 F.3d at 1206. The other instruction was also given by Judge Burns in his own fashion as follows:

> The function of the grand jury, in federal court at least, is to determine probable cause. That's the simple formulation that I mentioned to a number of you during the jury selection process. Probable cause is just an analysis of whether a crime was committed and there's a reasonable basis to believe that and whether a certain person is associated with the commission of that crime, committed it or helped commit it.
>
> If the answer is yes, then as grand jurors your function is to find that the probable cause is there, that the case has been substantiated, and it should move forward. If conscientiously, after listening to the evidence, you say "No, I can't form a reasonable belief has anything to do with it, then your obligation, of course, would be to decline to indict, to turn the case away and not have it go forward.

Partial Transcript pp. 3-4.

> Probable cause means that you have an honestly held conscientious belief and that the belief is reasonable that a federal crime was committed and that the person to be indicted was somehow associated with the commission of that crime. Either they committed it themselves or they helped someone commit it or they were part of a conspiracy, an illegal agreement, to commit that crime.
>
> To put it another way, you should vote to indict when the evidence presented to you is sufficiently strong to warrant a reasonable person to believe that the accused is probably guilty of the offense which is proposed.

Partial Transcript p. 23.

While the new grand jurors were told by Judge Burns that they could not question the wisdom of the criminal laws per Navarro-Vargas, they were also told by Judge Burns they had the

---

[9] The court upheld the instruction stating:

> This instruction does not violate the grand jury's independence. The language of the model charge does not state that the jury "must" or "shall" indict, but merely that it "should" indict if it finds probable cause. As a matter of pure semantics, it does not "eliminate discretion on the part of the grand jurors," leaving room for the grand jury to dismiss even if it finds probable cause.

408 F.3d at 1205 (confirming holding in United States v. Marcucci, 299 F.3d 1156, 1159 (9th Cir. 2002) (per curiam)). "In this respect, the grand jury has even greater powers of nonprosecution than the executive because there is, literally, no check on a grand jury's decision not to return an indictment. 408 F.3d at 1206.

discretion not to return an indictment per Navarro-Vargas. Further, if a potential grand juror could not be dissuaded from questioning the wisdom of the criminal laws, that grand juror should be dismissed as a potential jury nullification advocate. See Merced v. McGrath, 426 F.3d 1076, 1079-80 (9th Cir. 2005). Thus, there was no error requiring dismissal of this Indictment or any other indictment by this Court exercising its supervisory powers.

Further, a reading of the dialogues between Judge Burns and the three excused jurors found in the Supplemental Transcript excerpts (Appendix 2) reflects a measured, thoughtful, almost mutual decision, that those three individuals should not serve on the grand jury because of their views. Judge Burns' reference back to those three colloquies cannot be construed as pressuring the impaneled grand jurors, but merely bespeaks a reminder to the grand jury of their duties.

Finally, even if there was an error, Defendant has not demonstrated he was actually prejudiced thereby, a burden he has to bear. "Absent such prejudice--that is, absent 'grave' doubt that the decision to indict was free from the substantial influence of [the misconduct]'--a dismissal is not warranted." Isgro, 974 F.2d at 1094.

3. The Addition to the "United States Attorney and his Assistant United States Attorneys" Instruction Did Not Violate the Constitution

Concerning the new grand jurors' relationship to the United States Attorney and the Assistant U.S. Attorneys, Judge Burns variously stated:

> [T]here's a close association between the grand jury and the U.S. Attorney's Office.
>
> . . . . You'll work closely with the U.S. Attorney's Office in your investigation of cases.

Partial Transcript p. 11.

> [I]n my experience here in the over 20 years in this court, that kind of tension does not exist on a regular basis, that I can recall, between the U.S. Attorney and the grand juries. They generally work together.

Partial Transcript p. 12.

> Now, again, this emphasizes the difference between the function of the grand jury and the trial jury. You're all about probable cause. If you think that there's evidence out there that might cause you to say "well, I don't think probable cause exists," then it's incumbent upon you to hear that evidence as well. As I told

> you, in most instances, the U.S. Attorneys are duty-bound to present evidence that cuts against what they may be asking you to do if they're aware of that evidence.

Partial Transcript p. 20.[10]

> As a practical matter, you will work closely with government lawyers. The U.S. Attorney and the Assistant U.S. Attorneys will provide you with important services and help you find your way when you're confronted with complex legal matters. It's entirely proper that you should receive the assistance from the government lawyers.
>
> But at the end of the day, the decision about whether a case goes forward and an indictment should be returned is yours and yours alone. If past experience is any indication of what to expect in the future, then you can expect that the U.S. Attorneys that will appear in front of you will be candid, they'll be honest, that they'll act in good faith in all matters presented to you.

Partial Transcript pp. 26-27.

Commenting on the phrase, "the U.S. Attorneys are duty-bound to present evidence that cuts against what they may be asking you to do if they're aware of that evidence," Defendant proposes that by making that statement, Judge Burns also assured the grand jurors that prosecutors would present to them evidence that tended to undercut probable cause. [Memorandum p. 13, 22.] Defendant then ties this statement to the later instruction which "advis[ed] the grand jurors that they 'can expect that the U.S. Attorneys that will appear in front of [them] will be candid, they'll be honest, and . . . they'll act in good faith in all matters presented to you.'" [Memorandum p. 22.] From this lash-up Defendant contends:

> These instructions create a presumption that, in cases where the prosecutor does not present exculpatory evidence, no exculpatory evidence exists. A grand juror's reasoning, in a case in which no exculpatory evidence was presented, would proceed along these lines:
>
> (1) I have to consider evidence that undercuts probable cause.
>
> (2) The candid, honest, duty-bound prosecutor would, in good faith, have presented any such evidence to me, if it existed.

---

[10] Just prior to this instruction, Judge Burns had informed the grand jurors that:

> [T]hese proceedings tend to be one-sided necessarily. . . . Because it's not a full-blown trial, you're likely in most cases not to hear the other side of the story, if there is another side to the story.

Partial transcript p. 19.

> (3) Because no such evidence was presented to me, I may conclude that there is none. Even if some exculpatory evidence were presented, a grand juror would necessarily presume that the evidence presented represents the universe of all available exculpatory evidence; if there was more, the duty-bound prosecutor would have presented it.
>
> The instructions therefore discourage investigation--if exculpatory evidence were out there, the prosecutor would present it, so investigation is a waste of time and provide additional support to every probable cause determination: i.e., this case may be weak, but I know that there is nothing on the other side of the equation because it was not presented. A grand jury so badly misguided is no grand jury at all under the Fifth Amendment.

[Memorandum p. 23.] (Emphasis added.)[11/]

Frankly, Judge Burns' statement that "the U.S. Attorneys are duty-bound to present evidence that cuts against what they may be asking you to do if they're aware of that evidence," is directly contradicted by United States v. Williams, 504 U.S. 36, 51-53 (1992) ("If the grand jury has no obligation to consider all 'substantial exculpatory' evidence, we do not understand how the prosecutor can be said to have a binding obligation to present it."[12/] (emphasis added)). See also, United States v. Haynes, 216 F.3d 789, 798 (9th Cir. 2000) ("Finally, their challenge to the government's failure to introduce evidence impugning Fairbanks's credibility lacks merit because

---

[11] The term "presumption" is too strong a word in this setting. The term "inference" is more appropriate. See McClean v. Moran, 963 F.2d 1306 (9th Cir. 1992) which states there are (1) permissive inferences; (2) mandatory rebuttable presumptions; and (3) mandatory conclusive presumptions, and explains the difference between the three. 963 F.2d at 1308-09 (discussing Francis v. Franklin, 471 U.S. 314 (1985); Sandstrom v. Montana, 442 U.S. 510 (1979); and Ulster County Court v. Allen, 442 U.S. 140, 157 & n. 16 (1979)). See also United States v. Warren, 25 F.3d 890, 897 (9th Cir. 1994).

[12] Note that in Williams the Court established:

> Respondent does not contend that the Fifth Amendment itself obliges the prosecutor to disclose substantial exculpatory evidence in his possession to the grand jury. Instead, building on our statement that the federal courts "may, within limits, formulate procedural rules not specifically required by the Constitution or the Congress," he argues that imposition of the Tenth Circuit's disclosure rule is supported by the courts' "supervisory power."

504 U.S. at 45 (citation omitted). The Court concluded, "we conclude that courts have no authority to prescribe such a duty [to present exculpatory evidence] pursuant to their inherent supervisory authority over their own proceedings." 504 U.S. at 55. See also, United States v. Haynes, 216 F.3d 789, 797-98 (9th Cir. 2000). However, the Ninth Circuit in Isgro used Williams' holding that the supervisory powers would not be invoked to ward off an attack on grand jury procedures couched in constitutional terms. 974 F.2d at 1096.

prosecutors have no obligation to disclose 'substantial exculpatory evidence' to a grand jury." (citing Williams) (emphasis added)).

However, the analysis does not stop there. Prior to assuming his judicial duties, Judge Burns was a member of the United States Attorney's Office, and made appearances in front of the federal grand jury.[13/] As such he was undoubtedly aware of the provisions in the United States Attorneys' Manual ("USAM").[14/] Specifically, it appears he is aware of USAM Section 9-11.233 thereof which reads:

> In United States v. Williams, 112 S.Ct. 1735 (1992), the Supreme Court held that the Federal courts' supervisory powers over the grand jury did not include the power to make a rule allowing the dismissal of an otherwise valid indictment where the prosecutor failed to introduce substantial exculpatory evidence to a grand jury. It is the policy of the Department of Justice, however, that when a prosecutor conducting a grand jury inquiry is personally aware of substantial evidence that directly negates the guilt of a subject of the investigation, the prosecutor must present or otherwise disclose such evidence to the grand jury before seeking an indictment against such a person. While a failure to follow the Department's policy should not result in dismissal of an indictment, appellate courts may refer violations of the policy to the Office of Professional Responsibility for review.

(Emphasis added.)[15/] This policy was reconfirmed in USAM 9-5.001, Policy Regarding Disclosure of Exculpatory and Impeachment Information, Paragraph "A," "this policy does not alter or supersede the policy that requires prosecutors to disclose 'substantial evidence that directly negates the guilt of a subject of the investigation' to the grand jury before seeking an indictment, see USAM § 9-11.233 ." (Emphasis added.)[16/]

---

[13] He recalled those days when instructing the new grand jurors. [Partial Transcript pp. 12, 14-16, 17-18.]

[14] The USAM is available on-line at www.usdoj.gov/usao/eousa/foia_reading_room/usam/index.html.

[15] See www.usdoj.gov/usao/eousa/foia_reading_room/usam/ title9/11mcrm.htm. Even if Judge Burns did not know of this provision in the USAM while he was a member of the United States Attorney's Office, because of the accessability of the USAM on the internet, as the District Judge overseeing the grand jury he certainly could determine the required duties of the United States Attorneys appearing before the grand jury from that source.

[16] See www.usdoj.gov/usao/eousa/foia_reading_room/usam/title9/5mcrm.htm. Similarly, this new section does not bestow any procedural or substantive rights on defendants.

The facts that Judge Burns' statement contradicts Williams, but is in line with self-imposed guidelines for United States Attorneys, does not create the constitutional crisis proposed by Defendant. No improper presumption/inference was created when Judge Burns reiterated what he knew to be a self-imposed duty to the new grand jurors. Simply stated, in the vast majority of the cases the reason the prosecutor does not present "substantial" exculpatory evidence, is because no "substantial" exculpatory evidence exists.[17/] If it does exist, as mandated by the USAM, the evidence should be presented to the grand jury by the Assistant U.S. Attorney upon pain of possibly having his or her career destroyed by an Office of Professional Responsibility investigation. Even if there is some nefarious slant to the grand jury proceedings when the prosecutor does not present any "substantial" exculpatory evidence, because there is none, the negative inference created thereby in the minds of the grand jurors is legitimate. In cases such as Defendant's, the Government has no "substantial" exculpatory evidence generated from its investigation or from submissions tendered by the defendant.[18/] There is nothing wrong in this scenario with a grand juror inferring from this state-of-affairs that there is no "substantial" exculpatory evidence, or even if some exculpatory evidence were presented, the evidence presented represents the universe of all available exculpatory evidence.

> Under this policy, the government's disclosure will exceed its constitutional obligations. This expanded disclosure policy, however, does not create a general right of discovery in criminal cases. Nor does it provide defendants with any additional rights or remedies.

USAM 9-5.001, ¶ "E". See www.usdoj.gov/usao/eousa/foia_reading_room/usam/title9/ 5mcrm.htm.

[17] Recall Judge Burns also told the grand jurors that:

> [T]hese proceedings tend to be one-sided necessarily. . . . Because it's not a full-blown trial, you're likely in most cases not to hear the other side of the story, if there is another side to the story.

Partial transcript p. 19.

[18] Realistically, given "that the grand jury sits not to determine guilt or innocence, but to assess whether there is adequate basis for bringing a criminal charge [i.e. only finding probable cause]," Williams, 504 U.S. at 51 (citing United States v. Calandra, 414 U.S. 338, 343-44 (1974)), no competent defense attorney is going to preview the defendant's defense story prior to trial assuming one will be presented to a fact-finder. Therefore, defense submissions to the grand jury will be few and far between.

Further, just as the instruction language regarding the United States Attorney attacked in Navarro-Vargas was found to be "unnecessary language [which] does not violate the Constitution," 408 F.3d at 1207, so too the "duty-bound" statement was unnecessary when charging the grand jury concerning its relationship with the United States Attorney and her Assistant U.S. Attorneys, and does not violate the Constitution. In United States v. Isgro, 974 F.2d 1091 (9th Cir. 1992), the Ninth Circuit while reviewing Williams established that there is nothing in the Constitution which requires a prosecutor to give the person under investigation the right to present anything to the grand jury (including his or her testimony or other exculpatory evidence), and the absence of that information does not require dismissal of the indictment. 974 F.2d at 1096 ("Williams clearly rejects the idea that there exists a right to such 'fair' or 'objective' grand jury deliberations."). That the USAM imposes a duty on United States Attorneys to present "substantial" exculpatory evidence to the grand jury is irrelevant since by its own terms the USAM excludes defendants from reaping any benefits from the self-imposed policy.[19/] Therefore, while the "duty-bound" statement was an interesting tidbit of information, it was unnecessary in terms of advising the grand jurors of their rights and responsibilities, and does not cast an unconstitutional pall upon the instructions which requires dismissal of the indictment in this case or any case. The grand jurors were repeatedly instructed by Judge Burns that, in essence, the United Sates Attorneys are "good guys," which was authorized by Navarro-Vargas. 408 F.3d at 1206-07 ("laudatory comments . . . not vouching for the prosecutor"). But he also repeatedly "remind[ed] the grand jury that it stands between the government and the accused and is independent," which was also required by Navarro-Vargas. 408 F.3d at 1207. In this context the unnecessary "duty-bound" statement does not mean the instructions were constitutionally defective requiring dismissal of this indictment or any indictment.

The "duty bound" statement constitutional contentions raised by Defendant do not indicate that the "'structural protections of the grand jury have been so compromised as to render the

---

[19] The apparent irony is that although an Assistant U.S. Attorney will not lose a case for failure to present exculpatory information to a grand jury per Williams, he or she could lose his or her job with the United States Attorney's Office for such a failure per the USAM.

proceedings fundamentally unfair, allowing the presumption of prejudice' to the defendant," and "[the] defendant can[not] show a history of prosecutorial misconduct that is so systematic and pervasive that it affects the fundamental fairness of the proceeding or if the independence of the grand jury is substantially infringed." Isgro, 974 F.2d at 1094 (citation omitted). Therefore, this Indictment, or any other indictment, need not be dismissed.

C. The Government Does Not Oppose Leave To File Further Motions, So Long As They Are Based on New Evidence

The Government does not object to the granting of leave to file further motions as long as the order applies equally to both parties and any additional defense motions are based on newly discovered evidence or discovery provided by the Government subsequent to the instant motion.

III

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

A. Government Motion For Fingerprint Exemplars

Tthe Government requests that Defendant be ordered to make himself available for fingerprint exemplars at a time and place convenient to the Government's fingerprint expert. See United States v. Kloepper, 725 F. Supp. 638, 640 (D. Mass. 1989) (the District Court has "inherent authority" to order a defendant to provide handwriting exemplars, fingerprints, and palmprints).

Because the fingerprint exemplars are sought for the sole purpose of proving Defendant's identity, rather for than investigatory purposes, the Fourth Amendment is not implicated. See United States v. Garcia-Beltran, 389 F.3d 864, 866-68 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing United States v. Parga-Rosas, 238 F.3d 1209, 1215 (9th Cir. 2001)). Furthermore, an order requiring Defendant to provide fingerprint exemplars does not infringe on Defendant's Fifth Amendment rights. See Schmerber v. California, 384 U.S. 757, 770-71 (1966) (the Fifth Amendment privilege "offers no protection against compulsion to submit to fingerprinting"); Williams v. Schario, 93 F.3d 527, 529 (8th Cir. 1996) (the taking of fingerprints in the absence of Miranda warnings did not constitute testimonial incrimination as proscribed by the Fifth Amendment).

B. Government's Motion to Compel Reciprocal Discovery

1. All Evidence That Defendant Intends to Introduce in His Case-In-Chief

Since the Government will honor Defendant's request for disclosure under Rule 16(a)(1)(E), the Government is entitled to reciprocal discovery under Rule 16(b)(1). Pursuant to Rule 16(b)(1), requests that Defendant permit the Government to inspect, copy and photograph any and all books, papers, documents, photographs, tangible objects, or make copies or portions thereof, which are within the possession, custody, or control of Defendant and which Defendant intends to introduce as evidence in his case-in-chief at trial.

The Government further requests that it be permitted to inspect and copy or photograph any results or reports of physical or mental examinations and of scientific tests or experiments made in connection with this case, which are in the possession and control of Defendant, which he intends to introduce as evidence-in-chief at the trial, or which were prepared by a witness whom Defendant intends to call as a witness. The Government also requests that the Court make such order as it deems necessary under Rules 16(d)(1) and (2) to ensure that the Government receives the reciprocal discovery to which it is entitled.

2. Reciprocal Jencks – Statements By Defense Witnesses

Rule 26.2 provides for the reciprocal production of Jencks material. Rule 26.2 requires production of the prior statements of all witnesses, except a statement made by Defendant. The time frame established by Rule 26.2 requires the statements to be provided to the Government after the witness has testified. However, to expedite trial proceedings, the Government hereby requests that Defendant be ordered to provide all prior statements of defense witnesses by a reasonable date before trial to be set by the Court. Such an order should include any form in which these statements are memorialized, including but not limited to, tape recordings, handwritten or typed notes and reports.

//

//

//

IV

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the United States requests that the Court deny Defendant's motions and grant the United States' motions for reciprocal discovery and fingerprint exemplars.

Dated: May 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

KAREN P. HEWITT
United States Attorney

s/Lawrence A. Casper
LAWRENCE A. CASPER
Assistant U.S. Attorney

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. JAIME MOJICA-GONZALEZ, Defendant.	)	Criminal Case No. 08CR1006-BTM CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT:

I, Lawrence A. Casper, am a citizen of the United States and am at least eighteen years of age. My business address is 880 Front Street, Room 6293, San Diego, California 92101-8893.

I am not a party to the above-entitled action. I have caused service of

UNITED STATES' RESPONSE AND OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTIONS TO: (1)COMPEL DISCOVERY; (2) DISMISS INDICTMENT DUE TO GRAND JURY MISINSTRUCTION; AND (3) GRANT LEAVE TO FILE FURTHER MOTIONS; TOGETHER WITH STATEMENT OF FACTS, MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES AND UNITED STATES' MOTIONS TO COMPEL FINGERPRINT EXEMPLARS AND FOR RECIPROCAL DISCOVERY

on the following parties by electronically filing the foregoing with the Clerk of the District Court using its ECF System, which electronically notifies them.

1. Elizabeth Barros, Esq., Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc.

I hereby certify that I have caused to be mailed the foregoing, by the United States Postal Service, to the following non-ECF participants on this case:

1. None

the last known address, at which place there is delivery service of mail from the United States Postal Service.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on May 7, 2008.

s/ Lawrence A. Casper
LAWRENCE A. CASPER